

UNITED NATIONS
DISARMAMENT
COMMISSION



GENERAL

DC/SC.1/FV.151
27 August 1957

ENGLISH

SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE DISARMAMENT COMMISSION

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Lancaster House, London,
on Tuesday, 27 August 1957, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. ZORIN

(Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics)

UN. LIBRARY

19 SEP 1957

PAV. COLLECTION

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Russian): The Soviet Government considers it necessary to make a statement at today's meeting of this Sub-Committee.

Although I am in the chair today, I shall take the liberty of opening the meeting with that statement, since it is one of general significance for the work of our Sub-Committee as a whole.

If there are no objections, I shall proceed.

On the instructions of the Soviet Government, I shall read out the Soviet Government's statement in connexion with the disarmament talks.

"Statement of the Soviet Government with reference
to the disarmament talks"

"For more than ten years now, talks on disarmament have been proceeding in the United Nations. The United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee, to which the General Assembly of the United Nations has assigned a vital task -- to frame an international disarmament agreement ensuring the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons and a substantial reduction in the armaments and armed forces of States, under suitable international control -- have been in existence for many years. Never before has mankind been confronted by so urgent and burning an international problem as that of disarmament and the prohibition of atomic weapons, a problem which arrests the attention of all the peoples of the world. And that is understandable, for unless a constructive solution is found to the problem of disarmament no country will be able to feel itself free from the threat of a new war, with the use of weapons of mass destruction, i.e., of atomic and hydrogen bombs. The fate of millions upon millions of people in the various parts of the globe now depends on whether the Powers reach agreement on practical measures of disarmament. It is for this reason that the peoples are demanding with ever-increasing insistence that measures should be adopted

(The Chairman)

forthwith to put an end to the armaments race, and above all to remove the threat of war.

"While the Disarmament Sub-Committee marks time, the armaments race continues

"So far, the work of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and its Sub-Committee has failed to yield positive results. There is no truth in the assertions of those who are now trying to give world public opinion the impression that the disarmament talks that have been going on in London for five months, at this session of the Sub-Committee, have made satisfactory progress. In all this time the Sub-Committee has not advanced one inch towards the solution of the problems referred to it. Meanwhile, the Governments of the Western Powers have been constantly increasing the production of all types of armaments, and particularly of means of mass destruction such as atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"While the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee has been meeting in London, the Council of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc decided at its last session in Bonn to place atomic weapons at the disposal of a number of West European States members of the bloc, including Western Germany.

"Despite energetic protests by the peoples of many lands, the United States Government has stationed its special atomic units in the territories of the Western European States members of NATO. All this has been taking place under cover of fruitless disarmament talks.

"Little wonder, then, that the peoples are more and more beginning to ask the reasons for this situation. They wish to know whether the States represented in this Sub-Committee are really trying to achieve the vitally important goal of disarmament, and whether they are taking all the necessary steps to that end. No one will evade an

(The Chairman)

answer to these questions, for the problem of disarmament profoundly affects the interests of literally every family and every individual, wherever they may live. The extremely unsatisfactory situation with regard to the disarmament talks which have now been going on for many years, so far without any result, justifies the disquiet and anxiety felt by wide masses of people. It is becoming increasingly obvious to them that those who are responsible for the policies of the Governments of the Western Powers represented in the United Nations Disarmament Sub-Committee, in particular that of the United States, do not really want a disarmament agreement. True, high-sounding statements by these leaders about the desirability of disarmament are not lacking. But what is the value of these declarations if the activities of the Governments of the United States of America and of its NATO allies are really directed towards the continuation of the armaments race, further militarization of their countries, and preparations for an atomic war?

"It is not difficult to understand what compels the opponents of disarmament to resort to such shifts. In view of the ever-growing movement of supporters of peace all over the world, in view of the increasingly forceful demands of peace-loving people in all countries for a policy of peaceful coexistence and the cessation of the armaments race, no Government can afford openly to reject these demands and so risk provoking the indignation of its own people by its policy. Consequently the ruling circles of the Western Powers have decided to play a double game and, in order to deceive public opinion, are camouflaging their military preparations under talks about disarmament and trying to create the impression that some genuine effort is being made in the United Nations Sub-Committee, whereas in fact the Sub-Committee is marking time.

(The Chairman)

"The Government of the Soviet Union, which is a member of the Sub-Committee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, is aware of the importance of the task laid upon this Sub-Committee and of its responsibility to the peoples, and so considers itself bound to define its position on the disarmament question and to explain how it assesses the current talks on this question.

"The USSR advocates the speediest possible attainment of
agreement on disarmament"

"The Soviet Union's attitude towards the disarmament talks is determined primarily by the basis of its entire foreign policy, which is the principle of the peaceful coexistence of States, regardless of differences in their social structure, and the desire for a lessening of tension between nations and for the maintenance of friendly relations and the growth of peaceful co-operation between all peoples. The Soviet Government's desire has been to improve the effectiveness of the Sub-Committee's work and to ensure the adoption of appropriate decisions at an early date. For that purpose it proposed, even before the start of the Sub-Committee's present session, that on this occasion the session should be conducted at Foreign Minister level, with the participation of responsible representatives of the fighting service departments, preferably chiefs of staff. Unfortunately the Western Powers represented in the Sub-Committee rejected the Soviet Union's proposal, a fact which in itself has inevitably had detrimental effects on the Sub-Committee's work.

"At the very outset of the present session the USSR Government submitted for the Sub-Committee's consideration proposals comprising a comprehensive programme of

(The Chairman)

disarmament. This programme provided for the complete prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the renunciation by States of their use, the cessation of their production, their elimination from the arsenals of States, and the destruction of stockpiles of these weapons. In regard to conventional armaments the programme provided for a reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union and of the United States in the course of two periods to 1-1.5 million men, and of those of the United Kingdom and France to 650,000 men. The Soviet Union also proposed an agreement providing for the abolition of all military bases on foreign soil, the reduction of the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom and France stationed in Germany, and a reduction in the armed forces of the United States, the United Kingdom and France stationed in the NATO countries and in the territory of other foreign States and of the armed forces of the Soviet Union stationed in the Warsaw Treaty countries.

Provision was also made for the establishment of a system of international control over the execution of these measures by States. The Soviet Union also proposed the use of aerial photography in the areas of Europe in which the principal armed forces of the NATO countries and of the Warsaw Treaty countries are deployed, to a depth of 800 kilometres on each side of the line dividing the NATO forces from those of the Warsaw Treaty countries. It also proposed that a zone of limitation and inspection of armaments, including the territory of both parts of Germany and that of the States adjoining them, should be established in Europe.

(The Chairman)

"The Soviet Union's proposals were drawn up with due regard to the Western Powers' position and to the considerations put forward by many States at the eleventh session of the United Nations General Assembly. Nevertheless, the proposals of the Soviet Government received no support from the representatives in the Sub-Committee of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada. The representatives of these countries stated that they were not in any case prepared at present to consent to a radical solution of the disarmament problem, and proposed to negotiate for agreement on partial disarmament measures only.

"Although the Soviet Government favours an immediate settlement of the whole problem of disarmament, it deferred to the Western Powers' position and, desiring to shift the disarmament problem out of deadlock, submitted on 30 April a proposal for those partial measures of disarmament which in the present circumstances cannot be postponed and which, if implemented, would also pave the way to a comprehensive agreement on disarmament.

"The Soviet proposals for partial disarmament provided for reductions of armed forces, armaments and military budgets and for a gradual liquidation of bases on foreign soil, and included a series of measures for lessening international tension.

"Because of the categorical refusal by the United States and its allies to consent to a total prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the Soviet Union proposed on 30 April that as a first step States should give a solemn undertaking to renounce the use for military purposes of atomic and hydrogen weapons of all types, including aerial bombs, rockets carrying atomic or hydrogen warheads, irrespective of range, atomic artillery, etc.

(The Chairman)

"In view of the especially urgent need to halt atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, these proposals of the Soviet Union provided that this question should be separated from the disarmament problem as a whole, so that it might be settled without delay as a measure of the highest priority.

"It is essential to put an immediate stop to atomic and hydrogen weapons tests

"The struggle to bring nuclear weapons tests to an end has in recent years become world-wide. Millions of ordinary people in all the countries of the world are insistently demanding that dangerous experiments with atomic and hydrogen weapons should be stopped. The World Peace Council, expressing at its recent session in Colombo the will of the peoples of the world, appealed to all societies, movements, organizations, unions, groups and individuals working for the halting of atomic tests, to join together in a common endeavour to achieve this noble aim by their combined efforts.

"A conviction of the need for the speediest possible solution of the problem of halting atomic and hydrogen weapons tests is growing not only in world society at large, but also in Governmental and parliamentary circles of many States. Resolutions demanding the conclusion of an agreement for the cessation of nuclear tests have been passed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and by the Parliaments of India, Japan, Yugoslavia, Indonesia, Burma and other countries.

(The Chairman)

"The most eminent scientists in the world are turning their attention to the grave threat hanging over mankind as a result of the continuance of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests. In recent months, many hundreds and thousands of leading scientists in the Soviet Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan and many other countries have issued statements calling for the immediate cessation of nuclear tests.

"The Soviet Government fully shares the view of the Governments and parliaments of various countries, of large sections of the public and of scientists that the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons should be ended at once. Early action to this effect has been urged by the Soviet Government in various United Nations organs for several years.

"The need for the immediate cessation of atomic weapons tests is dictated above all by the fact that that step would to some extent prevent the further development of atomic weapons and the creation of new and still more destructive types of such weapons, and would be a first and important step on the road to the main objective, the complete prohibition of atomic weapons. It is self-evident that nuclear weapons tests are carried out to ascertain the effectiveness of the destructive powers of such weapons, with a view to making them a still more fearful means of mass destruction. The fact cannot be evaded that every test explosion of an atomic or hydrogen bomb in one country spurs on other countries to adopt similar measures, in order not to be "left behind". And in the last analysis this leads to a general intensification of the nuclear armaments race and makes the world situation increasingly tense and dangerous.

(The Chairman)

"It is highly important also that the very fact of an agreement on this question between the great Powers would react favourably on the whole international atmosphere and would help to strengthen confidence between States.

"It must also be borne in mind that even now the radiation resulting from nuclear explosions is a real danger to human life and health. The cessation of atomic weapons tests would prevent the harmful consequences of nuclear explosions.

"The Soviet Union proposed that the question of the cessation of nuclear testing should be isolated from the overall problem of disarmament and dealt with immediately as a separate issue, independently of any agreement on other disarmament questions.

"The advantages and the practicality of that proposal are obvious. Firstly, atomic and hydrogen weapons are so far being manufactured and tested by three countries only: the United States, the USSR and the United Kingdom; and consequently agreement depends exclusively on the goodwill of these Powers. Since the Soviet Union has declared itself ready to agree to an immediate cessation of tests, the matter rests with the two other countries -- the United States and the United Kingdom.

"Secondly, an agreement on the cessation of tests would be a simple measure requiring no complicated machinery, since in the present state of science its supervision could be carried out without creating any cumbersome system of control, and would be a perfectly practicable operation.

(The Chairman)

"The Soviet Union is in favour of the complete and unconditional cessation of nuclear testing. Since, however, the Western Powers show no desire for such a step, the Soviet Government, in order to smoothe the way to a mutually acceptable agreement, proposed that nuclear testing should be suspended at least temporarily, for a period of two or three years. In deference to the wishes of the Western Powers, the Soviet Union also proposed the establishment of control posts, on a basis of reciprocity, in the territories of the USSR, the United States and the United Kingdom and in the Pacific Ocean area, with a view to supervision over the execution of the agreement for the cessation of tests.

"One would have thought that such a measure, with its obvious benefits to the whole of mankind, could not possibly have given rise to any opposition. Yet it has so far proved impossible to reach agreement with the Western Powers on a cessation of nuclear testing, or even on a temporary suspension of two or three years. Until recently, indeed, the Western Powers have made no particular effort to conceal their negative attitude to this proposal.

"Faced with the unanimous demand of the peoples for the cessation of dangerous experiments with weapons of mass destruction, the United States and the other Western Powers represented in this Sub-Committee have now adopted different tactics, as is apparent from the statement made by the United States representative at the Sub-Committee's meeting of 21 August. Without formally rejecting the proposal for a suspension of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, the United States has nevertheless reduced to nil the possibility of agreement on that proposal by artificially linking its implementation with other disarmament measures on which agreement is impeded by serious difficulties,

(The Chairman)

difficulties which, again, result from the positions of the Western Powers themselves. In particular, the United States says that it will not accept even a temporary suspension of nuclear weapons tests until agreement is reached on a cut-off of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes. But even under those conditions the United States is prepared to consider a suspension of tests for a period of only twelve months, that is, for a period no greater than that required for the preparation of the next test. True, the United States statement of 21 August refers to the suspension of tests for a further period of twelve months; but in view of the conditions laid down the prospects of agreement on this period are even more doubtful than those of reaching agreement on the first period.

"What, then, does the United States proposal for the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for military purposes, which is put forward as an absolute condition for United States agreement to a suspension of nuclear tests, actually amount to?

"The United States Secretary of State, in one of his recent statements, said that his country had come to the conclusion that so far as concerned existing stocks of fissionable materials, it could not without risk renounce their use for the production of weapons. This point of view is fully reflected in the latest proposals of the Western Powers, which provide not only for the retention by States of their existing stocks of nuclear weapons, but also for the continued production of these weapons from existing stocks of fissionable materials. Added to which, the Western Powers categorically oppose the prohibition of nuclear weapons.

(The Chairman)

"What, then, is the point of the United States proposal on the cut-off of the production of fissionable material for military purposes, if after its adoption the United States continues to manufacture atomic and hydrogen bombs just as before and if atomic weapons have still not been outlawed? All this evidence shows that in fact neither the United States nor the United Kingdom really means to stop producing atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"It is sometimes stated that the proposal to cut off the production of fissionable materials for military purposes is aimed at preventing the spread of atomic weapons 'throughout the world'. However, the actions of the United States indicate exactly the opposite. It is well known that while the United States Government is saying that atomic weapons must not be allowed to spread throughout the world, it is simultaneously preparing and, more than preparing, giving effect to plans to supply atomic weapons to its partners in NATO, a move which obviously aggravates the international situation and makes a solution to the problem of disarmament still harder to find.

"The cut-off of the production of fissionable material for military purposes will be of real significance in eliminating the threat of atomic war only when it is indissolubly linked to the prohibition of atomic weapons, their elimination from the armaments of States, and the destruction of atomic weapons stockpiles. That is the solution of the problem advocated by the Soviet Union.

"The linking by the Western Powers of the cessation of nuclear weapons tests with the cut-off of production of fissionable materials for military purposes shows that they are far from desirous of contributing towards the halting of nuclear weapons tests. All this is bound to hamper settlement of the urgent problem of prohibiting nuclear tests.

(The Chairman)

"It must be added that the United States and its partners have made the cessation of atomic weapons tests conditional also upon the reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces, a clear indication that they do not wish at the present time to solve the problem of halting atomic weapons tests, seeing that they themselves are hindering the attainment of agreement on this other question too.

"Another matter worthy of attention is that certain elements among the Western Powers have recently begun to spread stories about a so-called 'clean' atomic weapon, the making of which, they claim, demands the continuance of tests. There is no doubt that they have found this myth which they have been circulating about a 'clean' atomic weapon necessary in order to justify by some means their opposition to the discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests, and that it is intended further to impede the attainment of agreement on this question. It is not hard to see that this is yet another attempt deliberately to confuse the simple, clear and very long-standing issue of stopping nuclear weapons tests.

"The discussion in the United Nations Sub-Committee of the question of halting nuclear weapons tests shows that the responsibility for the continued experimental explosions of atomic and hydrogen bombs lies fairly and squarely with the Governments of the Western Powers and, first and foremost with those of the United States and the United Kingdom.

"States should renounce the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons"

"In the period between the two World Wars public opinion, as is known, unanimously condemned chemical and biological weapons, and the use of such weapons was prohibited by appropriate international conventions. This ban had positive results. Whereas chemical weapons were used in the First World War, in the Second

World War the belligerents did not resort to chemical and biological warfare. Now, however, there have appeared weapons of mass destruction many times more terrible in their effects: nuclear weapons, which have as their target not only military objectives but above all large cities, centres of industry and culture built by centuries of man's work and creative genius.

"It is understandable, therefore, that since the very day when the first American atom bombs fell on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing many tens of thousands of peaceful individuals whose charred bodies were buried under their shattered homes, the peoples of the world have been more and more imperatively calling for the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. Governments cannot turn a deaf ear to this demand. It is the solemn duty of States to assume an obligation not to tolerate the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

"The leaders of the Western Powers, since they do not wish to outlaw nuclear weapons, like to justify their position by the argument that the possession of nuclear weapons by States acts as a deterrent and reduces the likelihood of atomic war.

"This is pure illusion. On the contrary, history teaches us that every armaments race has always resulted in its logical conclusion, war. That lesson is convincingly borne out by the events which preceded the First and Second World Wars. What guarantee is there that the present armaments race, and particularly the atomic weapons race, will not unleash armed conflicts or lead to a new world war in which atomic and hydrogen weapons will be used? There is no such guarantee.

(The Chairman)

"The Governments of the Western Powers are trying to make out that the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons is legal and that the need is not to renounce their use but merely to define the conditions and circumstances in which they may be used. In particular, it is proposed that the use of nuclear weapons shall be recognized as legal in accordance with Article 51 of the United Nations Charter, which provides that States have a right of self-defence if attacked. But it can easily be seen that to adopt such a form of words would by no means result in the prohibition of atomic weapons, but would in fact legalize their use. It would leave a loophole authorizing an aggressor to resort to atomic and hydrogen weapons under the guise of self-defence. Have there not been countless cases in history of aggressors invoking self-defence as an excuse? Did not Hitler himself cry 'self-defence' when attacking other States?

"It is easy to see that the Western Powers' position is radically opposed to the interests of the peoples, who long to be freed from the threat of atomic war and for nuclear weapons to be absolutely prohibited and eliminated from the arsenals of States. An important step towards the attainment of this aim would be made if the States possessing such weapons gave a voluntary undertaking to renounce their use.

"An agreement to renounce the use of nuclear weapons would be of exceptional significance for peace and would do much to ease international tension. Such an agreement would create an atmosphere of moral and political condemnation of barbarous atomic weapons and would do much to restore confidence in the relations between States.

(The Chairman)

It would at the same time be an important step on the road towards the complete prohibition of atomic weapons, and would demonstrate clearly to the peoples of the world that the Powers possessing nuclear weapons had moved from words to actions and were taking positive measures to free mankind from the threat of atomic war.

"The Soviet Union favours a substantial reduction in armed forces,
armaments and military expenditure"

"Twelve years after the end of the Second World War, the armed forces of the principal Western Powers have still not been reduced to a level appropriate to peacetime conditions, and are still stationed in foreign territories as if the war were still going on.

"As the facts show, the United States, the United Kingdom and France are not even attempting to rectify this abnormal situation; indeed they are preparing for a new war.

"Only four years after the end of the Second World War, at the instigation of the United States Government supported by the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, a military grouping of States was formed; a grouping hostile to the Soviet Union and certain other States which had been allies of the United States, the United Kingdom and France in the struggle against Hitlerite aggression. In recent years the construction of United States air and naval bases in foreign territories near the borders of the Soviet Union and the countries friendly to it has been proceeding on a more and more massive scale. It is known that between 1951 and 1957 the number of NATO air bases alone in Europe rose from fifteen to 150. Feverish steps are being taken in the NATO countries to equip troops of all arms with atomic and hydrogen weapons and various types of rockets. The military

(The Chairman)

budgets of many countries are dozens of times higher than the normal peace-time levels and swallow up an over-increasing part of the productive labour of the population. In this connexion the following facts are worthy of notice. In 1956 the total armed forces of the NATO countries numbered 6 or 7 million, and their total military expenditure in 1957 is at least 58,000 to 60,000 million dollars. In the United States alone 43,300 million dollars, or 63 per cent of the budget, has been approved for military expenditure in 1957-1958. Nevertheless, even this rate and scale do not satisfy the partisans of the armaments race. They complain that the rate is not high enough.

"Why is all this being done? Will all these military preparations help to secure peace or security for any Power? The answer can only be in the negative. Such measures as the preparations for atomic war that are being made in Europe by the aggressive North Atlantic bloc, and the creation of a wide network of United States military bases abroad, profoundly jeopardize the security of many States, especially those on whose territory these preparations are being made; in addition to which the increased international tension to which they give rise is itself fraught with the threat of war.

"People may say that the Soviet Union is also arming itself and spending considerable sums on defence. That is, of course, true. But it goes without saying that the USSR and other peace-loving Governments cannot ignore the fact that a ring of United States military bases, called NATO bases, has been set up round the Soviet Union, and that, as the representatives of the high command of this aggressive military

bloc have themselves stated on more than one occasion, the military preparations of the United States and its NATO allies are directly aimed at the Soviet Union and the other socialist States. In this connexion, reference could be made to numerous statements made by General Norstad of the United States Army, the present Commander-in-Chief of the NATO forces, by Mr. Strauss, the Minister of Defence of Western Germany, and by other military chiefs of NATO, who make no effort to conceal their plans of attack on the Soviet Union. They quite unashamedly, in season and out, vaunt the facilities their bases bring them for striking the first blow at the Soviet Union.

"The Soviet Government can naturally not overlook the fact that the Western Powers, while continuing to evade the conclusion of an agreement on disarmament, are at the same time pursuing a frantic armaments race and preparing themselves for a new war. All this compels the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist camp to take due measures to ensure their own security so that they may be ready to repel any aggression and curb the aggressor.

"On 18 March and 30 April the Soviet Government, desiring to put an end to the armaments race, submitted to the Governments of the Western Powers participating in the work of the United Nations Sub-Committee a number of highly concrete proposals for the reduction of the armed forces, armaments and military budgets of the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France.

"The carrying out even -- as a beginning -- of partial measures of disarmament would undoubtedly help to improve the situation in Europe and the world at large and to create an atmosphere of trust in the relations between States; and that would make it possible to make further progress on the road to disarmament.

(The Chairman)

"The Western Powers took a negative position on the Soviet proposals, and on various fabricated pretexts are evading the conclusion of an agreement providing for a genuine reduction in armed forces and armaments. Thus, in place of the levels of 1-1.5 million for the armed forces of the United States and the Soviet Union which they themselves proposed at an earlier date, they are now proposing that the armed forces of those two countries should be reduced by three stages to levels of 2.5 million, 2.1 million and 1.7 million men respectively. Moreover, any reduction of the armed forces below 2.5 million men is made conditional on the prior settlement of outstanding international problems.

"The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and France, and also of the Federal Republic of Germany, confirmed in a joint statement on 29 July that they regard prior settlement of the question of German reunification as a condition precedent to a disarmament agreement. To link disarmament with the reunification of Germany, particularly in view of the blackmailing attitude of the militaristic circles of Western Germany, which demand the unification of Germany on Adenauer's terms in return for the consent of the Federal Republic of Germany to disarmament, is to pile up new and serious obstacles to the solution not only of the disarmament problem but also of the German problem itself. But that is apparently just what the Western Powers want.

(The Chairman)

"The Soviet Union's proposal for reducing military budgets by 15 per cent met with no positive reaction from the Western Powers, which confined themselves to general statements and refused any definite commitment.

"The Western Powers also decline to discuss the Soviet Union's proposals for the liquidation of military bases and the removal of armed forces from the territories of foreign States.

"Thus experience has shown that all concrete proposals designed to call a halt to the armaments race are opposed by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom and other Western Powers.

"The Governments of the Western Powers give priority to matters of control, in an endeavour to focus discussion on these issues rather than on the main subject of these talks -- actual disarmament measures. The Soviet Government has made considerable efforts to narrow the gap between the positions of the participants in these talks regarding the international control of disarmament also. On 30 April of this year it proposed that during the first stage of disarmament control posts should be established on the territory of appropriate States, on a basis of reciprocity, at large ports, at railway junctions and on main motor highways, to ensure that there was no dangerous concentration of armed forces and armaments. The Soviet Union also proposed that control posts should be established in certain regions of the USSR, the United States, the United Kingdom and France and also in the territory of other signatories of the North Atlantic Treaty and the Warsaw Treaty.

"The Governments of the Western Powers have for some time been linking the attainment of an agreement on disarmament to the acceptance of their plans for aerial inspection by aerial photography.

(The Chairman)

"The question of aerial photography is not a new one. It has been raised before, as long ago as July 1955, at the meeting of the Heads of Governments of the Four Powers in Geneva, when the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, introduced his open skies proposal for the Soviet Union and the United States. The Soviet Union representatives immediately gave their reaction to that proposal. They said that aerial photographs alone would solve neither the problem of disarmament control nor that of preventing aggression or surprise attack; and that what was required was not photographs of broad areas but rather practical steps to reduce armed forces and armaments and avert the threat of war.

"Nevertheless, because the United States and its allies made the conclusion of a disarmament agreement conditional on aerial photography, and because the Soviet Government desired to meet these Powers half-way, it agreed to the use of aerial photography and indicated certain specific zones in which aerial inspection might be carried out.

"In its proposals of 30 April 1957 submitted for the consideration of the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission, the Soviet Government advocated, in particular, the establishment of aerial photography zones in the centre of Europe, where the principal armed forces of the opposing military groups are deployed — since this region constitutes the greatest threat to the peace and the security of States — and in the Far East. In introducing these proposals the Soviet Government assumed that the United States would meet it half-way, and that as a result favourable conditions would be created for the conclusion of a mutually acceptable agreement on partial disarmament.

(The Chairman)

"However, the United States and the other Western Powers failed to give their support to these Soviet proposals, thereby revealing their lack of any desire to co-operate in the framing of a disarmament agreement.

"Instead, the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada on 2 August introduced new proposals for aerial inspection, proposals providing for flights over the entire territories of the United States, Canada and the Soviet Union.

"What purposes has the United States in mind in now introducing these new proposals for aerial inspection? Neither the political leaders of the United States nor the NATO chiefs conceal their aims; they openly declare that they are preparing for atomic war against peace-loving States, preparing to bomb the territories of these States, their main industrial and political centres, communications centres and so forth, from the air. It is clear from the statements of the political and military leaders of the United States that the military chiefs of the United States and NATO would like to obtain for their use, by means of aerial surveys, the fullest possible information on the location of the Soviet Union's most important industrial and communications centres. It is obvious that the object of this United States proposal is the collection of reconnaissance data; that it would result not in an improvement but rather in a deterioration of the international situation; and that its real purpose is to contribute to the preparation of aggressive war, not to the removal of the threat of war.

(The Chairman)

"The Western Powers' proposal very characteristically does not provide for aerial reconnaissance over a number of countries where there are military bases of States members of the aggressive NATO military bloc. The exclusion from aerial inspection of countries which are not members of NATO but on whose territory there are foreign military bases would handicap the Soviet Union and its allies under the Warsaw Treaty, whose territories it is proposed to open to aerial inspection.

"The other United States proposal concerning aerial reconnaissance of the Arctic regions can scarcely be taken seriously, for flights over barren, sparsely-inhabited stretches of the Arctic would yield no information useful either for disarmament or for the prevention of a surprise attack by one State upon another.

"The fact that the Western Powers have submitted such unrealistic proposals to the Sub-Committee indicates that the United States and the other Western Powers do not want to conclude a disarmament agreement, although they are trying to give the impression that they are in favour of disarmament.

"It may fairly be stated that in the circumstances, that is to say given the gulf of distrust and suspicion yawning between the great Powers, the prevailing international tension, the armaments race, and the preparations of the NATO countries for atomic war, no peace-loving State could agree to flights over its whole territory without jeopardizing the vital interests of its national security.

In the circumstances, the Western Powers' proposals for flights over the entire territory of the United States, Canada and the Soviet Union can only be regarded as a trick designed to distract attention from the pressing problems of disarmament and to win complete freedom of aerial reconnaissance in order to prepare aggression.

"In connexion with the proposal of 2 August of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada on aerial photography, the Soviet Government stresses once again that no manner of inspection can shift the discussion of the disarmament problem out of deadlock. No kind of aerial photography can prevent surprise attacks by an aggressor possessing weapons of mass destruction together with the latest means of delivering them to the target, and armies numbering millions of men. A different way out must be sought.

"The Soviet Government considers that attention must now be devoted to the implementation of measures which would contribute towards the easing of international tension, would promote co-operation among States and the development of economic and cultural links, and would help to do away with commercial discrimination. The prohibition of war propaganda, particularly of propaganda regarding the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons against particular countries, could do much to improve relations among States. The resolution prohibiting war propaganda adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1947 is not being carried out. Laws prohibiting war propaganda have been passed only in the Soviet Union and in a few other countries. The absence of such laws in the other countries leaves the field clear for the dissemination of militaristic moods, enmity and hatred among peoples. Suitable measures to put a stop to war propaganda are called for in order to ease international tension and lessen the threat of war.

(The Chairman)

"The prohibition of nuclear weapons, the substantial reduction of armed forces and armaments and the abolition of foreign military bases in the territories of other States would make a vital contribution to the lessening of international tension and the creation of an atmosphere of international trust.

"If these steps were taken the present tension and distrust prevailing in the relations between the Powers would give way to friendly co-operation in trade, economic, cultural and scientific matters. There would then be no bar to the extension of contacts of every kind and the exchange of experience between States and peoples. In such circumstances the obstacles even to the carrying out of reciprocal aerial photographic surveys covering the entire territories of the Soviet Union, the United States and the other countries participating in NATO, SEATO, the Baghdad Treaty and the Warsaw Treaty would spontaneously fall away.

"The Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission is not fulfilling
the task assigned to it"

"As a result of the negative position taken by the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada, the Sub-Committee has been unable to adopt agreed decisions on the disarmament questions under consideration. Such urgent problems as the immediate cessation of atomic and hydrogen weapons tests, the assumption by States of an obligation to refrain from the use of such weapons, and the substantial reduction of armed forces, still remain unsolved.

"Why has the Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission so far failed to fulfil the tasks assigned to it, the tasks of putting an end to the armaments race and removing the threat of a new war?

(The Chairman)

"The reason is first and foremost the fact that, with the exception of the Soviet Union, the Sub-Committee consists of countries whose ruling circles are not interested in disarmament. As is well known, of the five members of the Sub-Committee, the four capitalist countries -- the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada -- play a leading role in the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

"Thus the Western Powers have to all intents and purposes handed disarmament over to NATO, their military organization. This fact causes particular alarm for the future of the disarmament talks. It is well known that the NATO leaders base all their calculations on the use of atomic weapons, the continuation of the armaments race, and preparations for a new war; and the transfer of the disarmament question to these people reflects the desire of ruling circles in the countries participating in the North Atlantic military alliance to doom the disarmament talks to failure.

"The United States and the other Western Powers represented in the Sub-Committee arrange matters in advance with the other members of NATO, including the Adenauer Government, which is militarizing the Federal Republic of Germany. At the same time, in the United Nations Sub-Committee, they refuse to hear the views of States standing outside the military blocs and showing a sincere concern to preserve peace, as for instance India, which requested the Sub-Committee to give it a hearing.

"This attitude of the Western Powers betrays their fear of a broad discussion of this important problem with States which are not members of their exclusive military groups; but, more than that, it is directly contrary to the terms of

(The Chairman)

the resolution in which the General Assembly at its eleventh session recommended that the Sub-Committee should hear and give prompt attention to the proposals on the disarmament question which have been made in the United Nations by other States.

"Although the attainment of agreement on disarmament depends primarily on the great Powers which possess the largest armed forces and have atomic and hydrogen weapons at their disposal, the solution of the disarmament problem is of equal interest to all nations of the world, both large and small. The successful solution of disarmament problems requires that consideration should be given not only to the proposals of the five States represented in the Sub-Committee but also to the views of other States Members of the United Nations, and particularly of those which are actively opposing the armaments race and the use of nuclear weapons and calling for the cessation of nuclear weapons tests. If a larger number of States representing the various continents and social systems were drawn into the discussion of disarmament questions in United Nations organs, the discussion would be given a more objective character and an opportunity would be provided for the voices of other Governments and peoples to be heard; which, unfortunately, is not possible in the Sub-Committee with its present narrow and one-sided membership. The present completely anomalous situation, in which not only are a number of powerful States interested in solving the problems of disarmament excluded from its work, but whole continents -- Asia, Africa, and Latin America -- remain entirely unrepresented, can no longer be accepted.

"In addition, the Western Powers have compelled the Sub-Committee to work secretly, in private, with the result that public opinion has been kept in ignorance, and has on many occasions been completely misinformed about the true state of affairs in the Sub-Committee. This situation apparently suits the

(The Chairman)

ruling groups of the Western Powers. It enables them to use the secrecy of the Sub-Committee's work as a pretext for evading direct answers to questions about the progress of the talks raised in parliaments and by the Press, and to make out that serious talks are taking place, whereas in actual fact the talks are making no progress. The question arises: what use are the Sub-Committee's talks to the United States and its partners? From everything that has been said above it follows beyond any doubt that the United States and the other Western Powers seek to use the Sub-Committee in order to mislead public opinion, to sow false illusions, and to deceive the peoples, who are vitally interested in bringing the armaments race to an end and removing the threat of a new war involving the use of nuclear weapons.

"The time when professional politicians and diplomats could decide questions affecting the basic and vital interests of peoples secretly and behind their backs has gone for ever. The peoples vividly recall the grievous sufferings and hardships of the Second World War, and they know what might befall them in a third world war, in our atomic and rocket age. They demand from States a clear and unambiguous answer to the question whether they stand for the continuance of the armaments race or for disarmament, for the prohibition of atomic weapons or for the preparation of an atomic war; and no Government can refuse to answer this question.

"In all countries the people are day by day playing a more active part in political life, and are waging a stubborn struggle against a situation in which the interests of a mere handful of millionaires making enormous profits out of

(The Chairman)

military orders have an overriding influence on the positions of the Western Powers towards disarmament problems and prevent the solution of these problems. The people will not allow the forces of war to prevail over the forces of peace and progress.

"A disarmament agreement can and must be achieved"

"There are at the present time real possibilities for the attainment of an agreement on some of the more urgent measures relating to disarmament and the removal of the threat of an atomic war. The opportunity must on no account be let slip.

"The Soviet Government has submitted to the United Nations proposals both on atomic weapons and on conventional armaments, on a comprehensive disarmament programme and on partial measures of disarmament. The most important duty of the States which bear the primary responsibility for the settlement of the disarmament problem is to show the proper desire and the good-will to attain agreement on disarmament questions, and to undertake a businesslike discussion of all the proposals which are before this Sub-Committee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. That is the only approach to this question which will produce the practical results expected from the United Nations by all those who cherish the peace and security of the peoples.

"The Soviet Government considers that the interests of a durable peace throughout the whole world and of the security of States would best be served by the execution of a comprehensive disarmament programme. However, if the Western Powers are not prepared to consent to comprehensive disarmament measures, the Soviet Union is ready to agree to the execution of partial measures. The Soviet

Government takes that position because it believes that, if mutual trust is to be established and the suspicion and fear which at present characterize the relations between States are to be eliminated, initial practical steps which can be carried out without in any way endangering States are particularly important.

"The Government of the USSR considers that the time has come at last to abandon words for deeds and to initiate practical steps towards disarmament. It therefore once again proposes to the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and Canada that, pending settlement of the other problems of disarmament, agreement should be reached on those measures which stand first in order of urgency.

"The Soviet Government, in view of the insistent demands of the peoples, suggests that as a first step, agreement should be reached to put a stop immediately and unconditionally to atomic and hydrogen weapons tests or to halt them temporarily for two to three years under appropriate control, without making that step depend on the execution of other measures of disarmament.

"The Soviet Government also proposes that agreement should be reached on partial measures of disarmament providing for a renunciation by States of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons, the reduction to specified levels of the armed forces, armaments and military budgets of States, the liquidation of military bases in the territory of foreign States, the reduction of the armed forces of the United States, the USSR, the United Kingdom and France in Germany, and the establishment of international control over the execution of these measures.

"Appropriate proposals by the Soviet Union on questions of disarmament were submitted for the consideration of the Sub-Committee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission on 18 March, 30 April and 14 June 1957.

"The problem of disarmament still remains unsolved. It is essential that we should move from idle discussion to action. It is important that we should make a first step in regard to disarmament, in order to clear the way to the gradual settlement of the problem as a whole, a problem which, given good-will, can undoubtedly be solved. It would do much to serve that purpose if disarmament questions could be publicly discussed in the United Nations not by five countries alone, but also by other States having a vital interest in the settlement of the problem of disarmament.

"The Soviet Government, for its part, will continue to concentrate all its efforts on reaching an early solution of this most important problem of the present day."

That is the statement I have been instructed by the Soviet Government to make at today's meeting of the Sub-Committee.

I am also instructed by the Soviet Government to ask for this statement to be issued as an official document of the Sub-Committee.

Mr. STASSEN (United States of America): I wish to reaffirm, in the terms in which it was presented at the 149th meeting of the Sub-Committee, the proposal in which the United States joined with Canada, France and the United Kingdom for a twenty-four month cessation of nuclear test explosions.

The United States joined in that proposal after a very great amount of study and consideration, and presented it on a basis that it considered to be sound and in the mutual interest of all States, and as a positive contribution towards reaching agreement as the successful outcome of our work in the Sub-Committee.

As I expressed it at the 149th meeting, during this twenty-four months' suspension of nuclear testing we would envisage also the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes under appropriate inspection.

From everything that I have learned since presenting this proposal I not only reaffirm it on behalf of the United States but express the view that it is a proposal that is rapidly gaining support from other States all over the globe. The early suspension of nuclear testing and the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, attained in a sound and sensible way, are twin objectives that appear to be supported by other States representing many different viewpoints, forms of government and political systems from continent to continent. Therefore, I do reaffirm it and restate it to the representative of the Soviet delegation for his early response upon its substance.

Joining with the representative of the French delegation, Mr. Moch, I endeavoured at the 149th and 150th meetings to answer questions requesting interpretation and clarification, and I gather that the proposal is now quite well understood by the Soviet Union.

(Mr. Stassen, United States)

I noted from the simultaneous interpretation of the speech just made by the representative of the Soviet Union the statement that an agreement on disarmament can and must be achieved, and that concrete opportunities are at hand. It would appear to me that this proposal on nuclear testing which Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States have put forward represents one of those concrete opportunities. It moves a great distance to meet the position that the Soviet Union has been taking; it moves that distance in a practical and realistic manner. Behind this proposal there are no devious motives, but only the definite aim of improving the prospects of peace. No one should miscalculate the objective of the United States in that respect; it is an objective of peace, and an impartial review of our policies and our actions throughout these years will convince everyone that peace is the paramount objective of the United States.

As I understood the simultaneous interpretation, the chairman of the Soviet delegation expressed some continuing regret that we had related our proposal to other measures for a first agreement on disarmament. So far as concerns the cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes, it seems to me that this is an objective that the peoples of all countries wish to see achieved; I believe that even the people inside the Soviet Union would want to see an agreement for the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes. I believe that the peoples of all States — not only the peoples of the States in the Sub-Committee which have presented the proposal, but the peoples of every Member State of the United Nations would want to see that agreement achieved. I have not yet heard, either before today's meeting or in the speech which the Soviet representative has just ended, any sound or supportable reason why that objective of the cessation of the production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes should not be accomplished. Is the Soviet Union willing to reach such an agreement? That is one of the key questions the answer to which will

(Mr. Stassen, United States)

determine whether the Sub-Committee moves forward to a successful conclusion or fails to make progress. The answer to that question is an answer that we look to the Soviet Union to provide at this time.

I would welcome also any light that the Soviet representative could shed for us on the interpretation that we are to place upon the statement that he has made at today's meeting. I recognized, of course, the restatement of many positions and presentations that had been made at various times during recent weeks and years. Those statements have, in the main, been answered previously, not only by the presentations which I have made but also by the actual conduct and course of action of the United States in its devotion to peace.

I interpreted the discussion of the proposal (DC/SC.1/62/Rev.1) of 2 August in today's statement by the Soviet representative as being a rejection of the broad proposal for the inspection of the entire territory of the United States, Canada and the Soviet Union. I would like to know if this interpretation of the statement which the Soviet representative said he made today on instructions from his Government as it relates to the broad proposal contained in section I, paragraph 1(a) of the document of 2 August, is a correct interpretation.

At the same time, as I followed the simultaneous interpretation it appeared to me that the Soviet representative did not reject the smaller alternative. He did pose some questions upon its value, but he said, as I understood, that we should start with proposals which did not raise the question of the security of the prospective States. That seemed to commend a small beginning. A beginning proposed on 2 August by the four States, Canada, France, the United Kingdom and the United States, in section I, paragraph 1(b) of their document, includes a territory where a moderate number of people live -- perhaps somewhere in the region of a million people on each side; it includes

(Mr. Stassen, United States)

some bases on each side, air and naval, and some armed forces. It is the place where the United States and the Soviet Union are closest to each other geographically. It would provide one of these concrete opportunities to begin to work together.

I did understand very distinctly from today's statement that the Soviet Union would be opposed to beginning the system of aerial and other inspection unless it was connected with the beginning reductions of armaments themselves -- reductions of armed forces and armaments and other steps of disarmament. We quite agree to that. We did not propose inspection on 2 August -- nor do we propose it now -- as a separate matter, but as part of the partial measures of disarmament.

As for the efforts to achieve agreement, I trust Mr. Zorin will permit me to say that I believe that if, in fact, the objective of the Soviet Union is to achieve agreement, this objective would be better served by not making long statements here that question the motives of the other members of the Sub-Committee.

I can quite understand some impatience. There have been times in the last two years when I have felt very impatient myself -- and not always towards other members of the Sub-Committee. This is a tremendously important and very difficult negotiation; the kind of threat and question that is involved by the very existence of modern weapons is recognized by all and has been stated again by the Soviet representative today. In endeavouring to do something about that situation Governments do move with caution, and rightly so; but, with all that, Governments have been moving during these five months. The Government of the Soviet Union moved from 18 March to 30 April, and it moved from 30 April to 14 June. The Governments of the other members of the Sub-Committee moved: they moved in preparation for the beginning of this series of meetings; they moved in May; they moved on 2 July; they moved again on 2 August and 21 August; also, as I have stated in the Sub-Committee recently, they are in the process of moving further.

(Mr. Stassen, United States)

Whether, on the very eve of such further movement, this kind of a complete statement of previous positions and of questions on our motives is to be expected, I do not know. As I say, I would welcome any further information about how we are to interpret the statement made today. Am I correct in interpreting it to mean that the proposal of 21 August is still under consideration? Am I correct in interpreting it to mean that the broad proposal in section I, paragraph 1(a) of the document of 2 August has been rejected? Am I right in interpreting it to mean that the small alternative of 2 August is still under consideration, but is spoken of in a disparaging manner? Am I right, further, in interpreting it as not withdrawing any of the Soviet proposals for partial agreement? And am I right in understanding that in it the Soviet Union did not withdraw from the negotiations but spoke of discussions in the United Nations, and that the Soviet delegation will continue to be here to receive our further proposals during these next days?

I understood that the statement was made, as the Chairman said, on the specific instructions of his Government, and if, before he responds to my questions, he wishes to confirm his response in consultation with his Government I would quite understand that; but if he feels that his instructions are adequate, and that he can shed further light today on how we should interpret his statement, I would welcome some such clarification.

As for our intentions, we are still, as we stated a few days ago, completing the proposals which we have been developing during these past months in order to show their interrelationship and the reasonableness of the various partial measures which could be fitted together into a first agreement.

As I understood Mr. Zorin's statement today, neither of the two specific partial measures which have been presented and which are of greatest importance -- the proposed

(Mr. Stassen, United States)

twenty-four months' cessation of tests and the small alternative zone -- was criticized as being contrary to the security interests of the Soviet Union, and neither was rejected. Both were less valuable in the view of the Soviet Union, but I suppose that under all the circumstances that kind of comment could be expected in this sort of negotiation.

I would express again my view that if there is, in fact, a wish to achieve an agreement which is in the mutual interest, the other portions of the statement which have the characteristics of direct reflection upon my country or my Government would have been better omitted. I will not respond to those portions -- especially today -- but will continue with our assignment from the United Nations, which is to endeavour to fit together the first step of disarmament which, with continued effort, would give a better prospect of reaching and sustaining more comprehensive agreement in place of the long record of failure to agree. We will continue to do this with the objective of making a contribution towards a durable peace.

Mr. MOCH (France) (translated from French): I do not want to discuss the substance of the statement which the Chairman has just read for an hour and a half on the orders of his Government. I will not try to interpret it today; I will merely say that it repeats earlier proposals with which we were already familiar, in terms which we have not heard for some years.

I admire the cool way in which my friend Mr. Stassen has just replied. I will try to follow his example, without raising my voice or expressing my feelings, I could almost say my indignation, with vehemence. What seem to me serious -- I might even

(Mr. Moch, France)

almost say intolerable -- are certain phrases that appear in a document emanating, not from a representative who wrote it himself, but from a Government which, having drafted, weighed and pondered it, has given instructions that it should be read today. That is why I consider it my duty to draw attention to certain expressions. I will do so calmly but clearly.

On three different occasions I noted, in the simultaneous interpretation, the use of the phrase "the aggressive North Atlantic bloc"; or "the Council of the aggressive North Atlantic bloc which met at Bonn". Those may be suitable expressions to use at a public meeting, a bad public meeting, a low and to some extent despicable public meeting; but they are not expressions which a government uses to describe other Governments with whom it wishes to live in peace and to consolidate friendly relations.

I have drawn attention to this accusation because -- I would say this calmly but clearly -- I cannot permit aggressive intentions to be imputed to the French Government. If this occurs again I shall be compelled to draw certain conclusions from it.

A little later on, I note, the Governments of the Western countries are accused of concealing their armaments race under a show of disarmament negotiations. This charge of duplicity, too, I reject. I am accustomed to negotiate honestly with men or Governments desiring to negotiate honestly.

A little further on, I see, we are accused of preparing for a new war. That is another of those remarks which resemble the earlier ones.

After hearing Mr. Zorin speak of the danger to health from radiation, I have been obliged to conclude that there are two kinds of radiation, that resulting from the detonation of American or British bombs, which is harmful to health, and that resulting

(Mr. Moch, France)

from Soviet bombs, which, on the contrary, has no such disadvantage -- for, at the very moment when Mr. Zorin is speaking to us of the dangers of radiation to health, his Government is in process of conducting a series of explosions. These, again, are arguments suited to the market-place. They are not a serious contribution to the cause of peace.

I see, again, further on, that in consulting the aggressive NATO bloc -- once again -- and (I quote from memory) in placing disarmament questions in the hands of these people, we are proving that the States participating in NATO desire these negotiations to come to naught. We are reproached for seeking preliminary agreement with the countries members of NATO. I cannot but conclude from this part of the statement, which is not Mr. Zorin's but that of the Soviet Government, that the latter commits its allies in the Warsaw Treaty without consulting them; otherwise it would not reproach us for consulting our allies.

Finally -- this will be my last comment of this kind -- when the Soviet Government (I am still not referring to Mr. Zorin personally) states that it is guided by the fact that underlying its policy is the principle of the peaceful coexistence of all States, whatever their system, (that is the phrase I noted down), I cannot but be profoundly sorry that this formula, while it has been used here, should not have been applied in other countries a few months ago. In saying this, I am thinking of the martyrdom of Budapest.

I have taken up these phrases because I do not think that a statement drafted in a tone which takes us back to the worst days of the cold war and propaganda really serves the cause of peace. I have tried to make my observations calmly. My conclusion

(Mr. Moch, France)

is the same as Mr. Stassen's. The expressions used about us by the Soviet Government in this document will not prevent us completing our proposals. Perhaps we shall do so with less hope having heard this statement than before; but we shall complete them in good conscience, with the certainty that we of the West will continue to make every effort to build some fragment of enduring peace, in the interests of all peoples.

Mr. NOBLE (United Kingdom): I must confess that I am a good deal disappointed on the day of my return to hear the Soviet Government statement which Mr. Zorin has just read to us. The tone of that statement and the language used in attacking the Western Powers were of a kind that had happily not been heard in our discussions until now -- or at least up until the time I went away from London three weeks ago. I greatly regret that Mr. Zorin should have been instructed by his Government to introduce this note into our discussions at this stage. I will not say any more about that now, but I agree very much with what Mr. Stassen and Mr. Moch have just said on the subject.

I regret still more that, as far as I followed the statement, it contained nothing new or constructive that might assist us along the path to agreement. I must, of course, examine all that Mr. Zorin said when the verbatim record is available in order to see whether my first impression is a correct one, but as far as I can gather from what we have just heard the Soviet position is becoming more and more rigid.

Far from showing any sign of wishing to make a constructive effort to narrow the gap between the Soviet and Western positions, it seems to me that the Soviet Government is now more concerned to criticize and to abuse the Western Powers and that, if

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

anything, the Soviet position is moving backward rather than forward. If I am not mistaken, Mr. Zorin has just told us that the Sub-Committee has not made a single step forward since we began our session early in March. I can only interpret that to mean that the Western Powers have not accepted the Soviet demand for an immediate and isolated suspension of tests, since, Mr. Chairman, there have most certainly been advances on other matters. I would just refer to two of them.

There were the important proposals (DC/SC.1/62/Rev.1) for inspection to safeguard against the possibility of surprise attack which the four Western delegations presented on 2 August. I only hope that what we have just heard from Mr. Zorin this afternoon is not the final answer of his Government to those proposals. Then there was another important development during the time I was away -- the proposal concerning nuclear testing which the Western Powers advanced on 21 August. That holds out the possibility of an important step along the road to agreement, and I hope that it has been studied by the Soviet Union, along with the other proposals made by the Western Powers, and that we shall hear a response from the Soviet Government calculated to advance the cause that I am sure we all wish to serve; and, as I need hardly remind my colleagues, that cause, in spite of what Mr. Zorin has said this afternoon, is the cause of genuine disarmament.

But, as I have just said, it seems that the Soviet Union is now throwing away those very advances of the last few months -- that it has repudiated them and is going back to a rigid insistence on its own proposals. I hope I may be wrong, but it seems indeed a very discouraging moment in our discussions, and I will not say any more or go into any greater detail now. I will only observe that so far as my

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

delegation is concerned Mr. Zorin's statement was substantially answered before it was made. Mr. Ormsby-Gore, in the statement he made at our last meeting on Friday, has already given our reasons for concluding that the Soviet Government's narrow insistence on the test question is incompatible with a genuine desire for real disarmament. In that connexion, Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with Mr. Ormsby-Gore that, "The suspension of tests...is not a disarmament measure at all". (DC/SC.1/PV.150, p. 3) As we have so often stated, in this Sub-Committee and outside it, suspension must form part of a partial disarmament agreement and, as such, in a partial disarmament agreement it would take its place with other equally and, indeed, more important measures. I have heard nothing from Mr. Zorin today which in any way changes that view.

Finally, perhaps I might say that one of the dominant reflections on this subject that occurred to me during my absence, and one which is uppermost in my mind as I return to these negotiations, is the undiminished urgency of the problems whose solutions we are seeking here. It has seemed to me on two occasions -- first when I read in the newspapers of the latest series of test explosions in the Soviet Union and today, again, when I read of a Soviet claim to have developed an even newer and more deadly, destructive weapon -- that never had there been more need for our discussions to reach a successful conclusion, and that never would the irony as well as the tragedy to mankind be greater if they were to fail.

In conclusion, there is one further point I should like to make. In his statement Mr. Zorin seemed, so far as I could make out, to deliver an attack, on the Sub-Committee itself. He complained about its membership and he complained about its method of work.

(Mr. Noble, United Kingdom)

So far as I can recall, this Sub-Committee was set up for a special purpose, and its membership and its methods were well worked out in the United Nations. I do not think that this is the place to complain about that. Mr. Zorin also accused us of the West of using this Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission "to mislead public opinion". Well, if anything is likely "to mislead public opinion", it is the statement we have heard this afternoon -- a statement made after the five months we have been working in this Sub-Committee -- and I would join Mr. Stassen in requesting that we might be informed of the interpretation we should put on it, because after these months and months of negotiation I really do think we should know what a statement like that is intended to mean.

Mr. RITCHIE (Canada): I wish to say that I was very much shocked by the tone and very much disappointed by the content of the statement which you, Mr. Chairman, have just read on behalf of the Soviet Government. I should like to join with Mr. Stassen in asking whether it is possible at this time for you to give us any clarification of the Soviet Government's considered attitude to these specific proposals which you gave us to understand, at our last meeting, would be carefully studied by the Soviet authorities.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Russian): Does anyone else wish to speak? If not, I should like to say a few words about today's remarks by Mr. Stassen, the United States representative, Mr. Moch, the French representative, Mr. Noble, the United Kingdom representative, and Mr. Ritchie, the Canadian representative.

(The Chairman)

Mr. Stassen, Mr. Moch, Mr. Noble and Mr. Ritchie asked me to comment on and clarify the statement that I made on behalf of the Soviet Government. Some of them said that they were waiting for the Soviet Union's reply to the proposals of 2 August and 21 August, and in general to the Western Powers' position on a number of the questions discussed by the Sub-Committee.

It seems to me that if the representatives of the Western Powers studied this statement attentively, they would all find the answers to their questions. In any event I see no need to make any comments or give any clarification at this juncture, for the statement discusses the proposals of both 2 August and 21 August in sufficient detail and sufficiently clearly. A careful study of this document will clear up any questions the Western representatives may have.

The second observation I should like to make concerns the dissatisfaction and the opinions expressed in the statements of certain representatives concerning the nature and contents of the Soviet Government's statement.

Obviously we differ in our evaluation of the events that have occurred both in the Sub-Committee and outside with regard to disarmament; and the Soviet Government considered it absolutely essential to state the truth concerning those events frankly and unequivocally. If the truth sometimes offends your eye, as the Russian saying is, it cannot be helped; but the dissatisfaction expressed by various representatives should in my opinion be directed against their own position in the Sub-Committee's work.

The Soviet Government's statement which I have read assessed the unsatisfactory state of the disarmament question clearly and frankly. You may not agree with that assessment; but then you have to prove that the Soviet Government's

(The Chairman)

statement does not reflect the true situation. And the true situation is, unfortunately, that in five and a half months we have not really reached agreement on any question, although the Soviet Government has made considerable efforts to meet the views of the Western Powers on a large number of questions and to submit proposals allowing for the points of view of the various Governments represented on the Sub-Committee.

Accordingly, I do not fully understand why Mr. Noble expressed the view that the Soviet Government's statement does not give an entirely correct estimate of what is being done, and asserted that we are repudiating all the advances made in the work of the Sub-Committee.

In disarmament questions, as indeed in other serious matters of politics, everything is determined by real facts and real actions. Words are not enough here, and expressions of intention not backed by genuine practical action cannot satisfy a Government desirous of real progress in disarmament.

That is why the Soviet Government, in its statement, has so frankly and directly expressed its dissatisfaction with the real progress of the Sub-Committee's work over the past five and a half months. It seems to me that anyone who takes a sober look at the work of the Sub-Committee will be bound to agree with the views expressed in the Soviet Government's statement.

I repeat, if any representative in the Sub-Committee does not agree, then it is his business to prove his case. The facts cited in the Soviet Government's statement are sufficiently eloquent and can hardly be disputed.

There will be true progress in regard to disarmament only when we reach real agreement on even one of the important questions before us. So far, no such agreement has been reached on any of these questions;

despite everything that has happened in the Sub-Committee, no genuine results have yet been achieved. In our age we cannot be satisfied with verbal statements about the desirability and the benefits of disarmament. Such statements cannot satisfy either the Soviet Government or public opinion in the Soviet Union and the other countries having a vital interest in the genuine attainment of agreement on disarmament, and in practical measures of disarmament.

My last comment relates to the remarks made by Mr. Moch and Mr. Noble when they referred to the new atomic and hydrogen weapons tests in the Soviet Union and apparently reproached the Soviet Government for continuing such tests while insisting on the cessation of tests. In that connexion I should like the members of the Sub-Committee to be fully informed of the statement issued yesterday by the Soviet Government in connexion with these recent tests, involving both the launching of a super long distance, inter-continental, multi-stage, ballistic rocket and the testing of nuclear and hydrogen weapons.

A TASS statement published yesterday speaks frankly about matter which should be of interest to the Sub-Committee of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. It says:

"The United Nations has for many years been fruitlessly discussing the disarmament question, including the problems of prohibiting atomic and hydrogen weapons and discontinuing their testing.

"The Soviet Government, unswervingly pursuing its policy of peace, has more than once introduced concrete proposals for a substantial reduction of the armed forces and armaments of States, for the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons, for the halting of tests of these types of weapons, and for other measures connected with the disarmament problem. The Western

(The Chairman)

Powers, however, have so far taken no real steps towards disarmament. On the contrary, they have obstructed in all kinds of ways the attainment of an agreement on this most important problem of our time.

"As is well known, the United States and its partners not only refuse to prohibit atomic and hydrogen weapons, but in fact do not wish to reach an agreement for the immediate and unconditional cessation of tests of nuclear weapons, and are continuing extensive series of tests of these weapons.

"Confronted by this obviously negative attitude of the Western Powers, and especially of the United States, towards a positive settlement of the disarmament question, the Soviet Government has been compelled to take all the necessary measures to ensure the safety of the Soviet State.

"At the same time, the Soviet Government will continue earnestly to seek an agreement on the cessation of tests and the prohibition of atomic weapons and on the disarmament problem as a whole, the successful solution of which concerns all peoples of the world."

I can only add to this statement of the Soviet Government that as soon as we reach an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom on the cessation of tests, the Soviet Union will immediately stop all testing. We are awaiting the agreement of the United States and the United Kingdom to this unconditional cessation of tests. The matter is now in the hands not of the Soviet Union, but of the United States and the United Kingdom, which are putting forward all kinds of conditions and will not agree to the unconditional suspension of such tests even for a period of two to three years.

Mr. STASSEN (United States of America): When the Soviet delegation has reviewed the questions that I have asked and the appraisal that I have made of its statement today I would ask that a further statement be made saying whether we have correctly evaluated that speech of today. If the Soviet Union is interested in an agreement it should be interested in being correctly understood. I have endeavoured to interpret the statement as it appeared to me. If my interpretation is not correct I should like to be told so at a future meeting.

Mr. MOCH (France) (translated from French): I am compelled to observe that what I said a moment ago is true. There are two types of radiation: radiation of Soviet origin is harmless; that of capitalist origin is dangerous. That is why the Soviet Union Government feels that it can continue its explosions without injuring the health of the whole world or polluting the atmosphere of the universe, whereas the opposite is the case when other Governments conduct such experiments. I merely note this fact.

I should like to add that we could hardly expect Mr. Zorin not to defend his Government's position in toto, or to accuse it of making incorrect statements.

Obviously, everyone says what he believes to be the truth. But what one believes to be the truth can be said without offence, even by a Government representing 200 million people. I should be heartbroken if that were not so.

Nevertheless, I am quite prepared to tell Mr. Zorin why we, on our side, distrust the Soviet Union. Mr. Zorin said a moment ago that words were not enough. Unfortunately there are deeds, deeds extending over the entire period from February 1948 to November 1956, which account for our attitude.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Russian): Does anyone else wish to speak?

If there are no further comments, we have to decide on the date of our next meeting. Before we do so, I should like, in connexion with Mr. Stassen's last comment, to ask Mr. Stassen and the other Western representatives who have heard the verbal delivery of the Soviet Government's statement to study it in the verbatim record, for it seems to me entirely possible that when they study the record of the statement the questions which occurred to them on immediate hearing of the simultaneous interpretation may cease to exist.

At any rate, it seems to me that the questions which interested Mr. Stassen, in particular, are answered in the actual text of the Soviet Government's statement. If there is anything in the statement which is not clear, I shall venture to ask Mr. Stassen to specify the points which he would like elucidated. But that of course can only be done after Mr. Stassen and the other representatives have examined the written text of the statement.

If there are no further comments, then let us fix the date of our next meeting. Does any representative wish to make any proposal or raise any point?

Mr. STASSEN (United States of America): I suggest the usual time, 3.30 p.m. tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN (translated from Russian): If there are no objections, then it is so decided. I propose that the usual communique be adopted and that the next meeting be held at 3.30 p.m. tomorrow.

(The Chairman)

The communique reads:

"The Sub-Committee of the Disarmament Commission held its one hundred and fifty-first meeting on 27 August 1957, at 3.30 p.m. at Lancaster House, under the chairmanship of Mr. V.A. Zorin, Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the USSR, and continued its discussions.

"The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, 28 August 1957, at 3.30 p.m."

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.